Information Technology Resource Management Council (ITRMC)
October 2, 2009, Meeting Minutes
(Approved by Council October 14, 2009)

The October 2, 2009 meeting of the Information Technology Resource Management Council was held in the East Conference Room of the Joe R. Williams Building, 700 West State Street, Boise, Idaho.

ATTENDANCE
Members/Designate(s) Present:
Mike Gwartney, (Chair) Director, Dept. of Administration
Richard Armstrong, Director, Dept. of Health and Welfare
Donna Jones, State Controller
Senator Les Bock (via phone)
Representative Branden Durst
Dennis Gribble, Vice President and CIO, Idaho Power Company
Mike Rush, Executive Director, State Board of Education
Col. Bill Shawver, Director, Idaho Bureau of Homeland Security
John Peay, IS Director, Idaho Supreme Court
Jerry Piper, Operations Manager, Cambridge Telephone Company
Craig Potcher, Information Technology Bureau Chief, Dept. of Fish and Game
Designates –
   Mike Key, Idaho State Police
   Jimmy Takata, State Dept. of Education

Absent Members:
Senator Patti Anne Lodge
Representative Tom Loertscher
Col. Jerry Russell, Director, Idaho State Police
Tom Luna, Supt. of Public Instruction
Steve Steiner, Idaho Bureau of Homeland Security

Others Present:

David Alexander, Idaho State University (VTC)	Dan Goicoechea, State Controller's Office
Shannon Barnes, Idaho Transportation Dept.	Bob Hough, State Controller's Office
Sally Brevick, Office of the CIO	Scot Maring, Office of the CIO
Carla Casper, Office of the CIO	Juan Oleaga, Idaho Transportation Dept.
Cheryl Dearborn, Office of the CIO	Terry Pobst-Martin, Office of the CIO
Dena Duncan, Office of the CIO	Ray Polzin, PERSI
Gail Ewart, Office of the CIO/ IGO	Jon Pope, Idaho Transportation Dept.
Bill Farnsworth, Office of the CIO	Jared Tatro, Office of Performance Evaluations
Randy Gaines, Idaho State University (via VTC)	Mike Seifrit, Idaho Dept. of Juvenile Corrections
Glen Gardiner, Dept. of Water Resources	Scott Van Hoff, U.S. Geological Survey
	Greg Zickau, Office of the CIO

CALL TO ORDER
Director Gwartney, Chairman, welcomed members and guests present and called the meeting to order.

APPROVAL OF PREVIOUS MEETING MINUTES
MOTION: Ms. Jones moved and Director Armstrong seconded a motion to approve the meeting minutes from August 26, 2009; the motion was passed.
(http://idaho.gov/itrmc/council/minutes/2009/20090826_ITRMC_meeting_minutes.pdf)

VIDEO TELECONFERENCING Standard 3131: VTC Dialing Plan

Cheryl Dearborn briefed the Council on the new Standard 3131. This Standard promotes a uniform dialing plan that will be used by all state agencies for video teleconferencing. The Standard was presented and approved by ITEAC on September 22nd, and shared with the VTC Committee on September 29th (the VTC Committee is a subcommittee of the Public Safety Education Communication Governance Council or PSECGC).

The purpose of this Standard is to:
- improve the ease of use of the video teleconferencing that is deployed in state agencies today, by ensuring that new and existing VTC installations have a uniform E.164 number/address;
- future-proof VTC use within state agencies by not having to re-number sites and by avoiding the duplication of numbers;
- ensure that VTC works in tandem with future iterations and combinations of enterprise initiatives such as voice and other unified communications.

Questions and Discussion
- Director Rush queried whether there were any commonly-used systems now that could not conform to this Standard. Ms Dearborn explained that under Section VI of the Standard, it is recognized that there may be some legacy equipment still in use that cannot conform to the E.164 addressing but it is recommended that older devices be upgraded to support the Standard where possible.

MOTION: Director Rush moved and Director Armstrong seconded a motion to approve Standard 3131: Video Conference Dialing Plan; the motion was passed.

The Chairman requested a report from Ms Dearborn regarding the VTC "Phone Book". Ms Dearborn advised that there is a site on the intranet (http://conferencing.idaho.gov) where all the conferencing information is located, this includes the existing VTC sites in the State, how to register, and how to use the State bridge.

Jimmy Takata asked how the database would be kept up to date. Ms Dearborn explained that the OCIO is currently responsible for updating the information for new sites but for agencies who still have to connect their sites to the state infrastructure, it would be their responsibility to keep the information up to date or to send the updated information to the OCIO.

Col. Shawver asked whether there were instructions on the intranet site for accessing the audio bridge. Ms Dearborn explained that, once someone had registered, they would have access to the instructions for creating an audio conference – these instructions are currently in development.

Rep. Durst noted that CISCO had recently acquired Tandberg and questioned how this might impact the State in terms of compatibility. Ms Dearborn confirmed that the State has a Tandberg bridge and noted that Tandberg and CISCO equipment was already compatible, though the merger might make integration even easier.

REVIEW OF PROJECTS

Greg Zickau introduced the Review of Projects with a reminder to the Council members about their statutory responsibilities, the aims of the review process, how it came about, and at what stage the process currently stands. (refer to slides: http://idaho.gov/itrmc/council/minutes/2009/20091002Project_Review.pdf)

Questions and Discussion
- Rep. Durst queried whether there were budget constraints that the Council should bear in mind. Mr Zickau explained that there is no specific, overall budget target, each project has its own budget information and there was only high level information from previous years in terms of what had been spent.

- Mr Zickau clarified for Ms. Jones that the projects being considered today had been reviewed and approved, from a technical standpoint, by their respective agencies and it was confirmed that they did adhere to ITRMC Policies, Standards and Guidelines. Craig Potcher noted that the IT Resource Advisory Committee (ITEAC) had considered a high level view of the projects, and how the projects conformed to State policies and practices, and the Committee had agreed that these projects should be presented to ITRMC.

- John Peay queried the consequence of a project not receiving the Council's approval. Mr Zickau advised that the outcome would be passed to the Governor's office along with any clarifications that the Council made. The Governor would then make his own decision based on that outcome.

1) IDAHO STATE UNIVERSITY: ENTERPRISE RESOURCE PLANNING
Randy Gaines and David Alexander provided an overview for the Council. (refer to slides:
http://idaho.gov/itrmc/council/minutes/2009/20091002_ISU_ERP.pdf

Questions and Discussion
- Chairman Gwartney queried whether ISU would be willing to work with the University of Idaho which currently has a banner system that needs upgrading. Mr Gaines explained that ISU had considered combining with the UI system but, while UI was open to this, the vendor was not. Instead, the two universities have talked about providing secure back-up data storage at each other's locations.

- Rep. Durst asked about the constraints of scalability and the impact on the budget. Mr Alexander explained that they had designed a hardware system that allowed for scalability. For instance the database currently has 4 CPUs but is capable of holding 8, the architecture allows for a second database to be added if necessary, and the two current portals could be increased to 4 without re-configuring the system.

- John Peay questioned whether, at the conclusion of this project, the $115 per student would still be required. Mr Gaines noted that some of the $115 would still be required for ongoing maintenance costs, but the university had not yet made a decision about re-allocating or cancelling the balance.

- Dennis Gribble asked how much of the functionality had been customized. Mr Gaines stressed that they were not customizing the base code of the Banner System in any way. However, the Banner System is a rule-driven system, allowing each institution to put its own rules into the system.
MOTION: Rep. Durst moved and Director Rush seconded a motion to approve the Enterprise Resource Planning Project; the motion was passed unanimously.

- Director Rush noted that the Office of the State Board of Education was working with the Superintendent of Public Instruction on a longitudinal data warehouse to track students through K-12. This is being funded primarily with a $6 million federal grant. The second part of the project requires a higher education component that ties the post secondary data in with the secondary data. This is going to necessitate the consolidation of higher education data and this ISU project could be part of that in terms of streamlining some of the higher education data processes. Mr Gaines noted that ISU was involved in the longitudinal data discussions and would be considering what progress could be made in the future.

- Mike Key noted the importance of considering risk management when consolidating systems. The collaboration between two universities in order to provide secure back up for one another was clearly of financial benefit for institutions that might not otherwise be able to afford this on their own.

- Chairman Gwartney conveyed his frustration at the millions of dollars that were being spent by various institutions putting in different systems for similar purposes, and he expressed his hope that this Council would continue to vet opportunities for consolidation, taking into account the risk management factor.

2) IDAHO TRANSPORTATION DEPARTMENT: DMV SYSTEMS MODERNIZATION

Shannon Barnes outlined the DMV Systems Modernization project. (refer to slides:
http://idaho.gov/itrmc/council/minutes/2009/20091002_ITD_DMV.pdf

Questions and Discussion
- Director Armstrong sought clarification about whether the same vendor for the initial phases would be involved for the later phases. Ms Barnes explained that there had been multiple pieces to this project, requiring multiple vendors. Initially there had not been sufficient funding to replace the whole system and, at that time, a particular vendor had been taken on that was later found to be not performing. At the same time the legislature decided that ITD needed a new system and not just "band-aid" what they already had. The initial vendor is therefore no longer being used. Director Armstrong queried further whether the project pieces already completed had to be replaced. Ms Barnes explained that, although it was possible that some changes may have to be made, there had been compliance at every stage with standards set by ITD.

- Col. Shawver queried whether any analysis had been carried out regarding the future bandwidth accommodation of data transfers. Ms Barnes explained that much of the work upgrading the communication infrastructure at the county level had been a coordinated effort. Switches and routers have been upgraded at emergency operations centers and ITD is considering, independently of this project, the management of the network and how to prioritize services in the case of an emergency.

- Jerry Piper questioned whether this system could be leveraged at the county level. Ms Barnes commented that computers had been upgraded as part of a federal grant from FMCSA (Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration) and there are new switches and routers for the bandwidth. However these will be reaching end-of-life and will need to be replaced. The fees that House Bill 334 set forth were for ongoing operations as well as improvements so replacements will be paid for from some of the revenue from the new fees.

- Director Armstrong sought clarification regarding the mapping of business processes. Ms Barnes noted that there are 104 county sites who have different business processes and the new system will require everyone to do business in the same way. That challenge is not being underestimated. A lot of work has already been carried out on the business processes, with help from some of the counties and, wherever possible, changes are being made prior to the new system being implemented.

- Mr Gribble asked there was a common information model or standard being used to drive the meta data across the whole state. Ms Barnes commented that this was the biggest problem for the project. The data is currently scattered everywhere and IBM has been working with ITD from the beginning on this issue. Ms Barnes added that the RPF will be sent out later than anticipated in order to allow more time to fully understand the data and develop a plan.

- Mr Peay questioned whether an "off-the-shelf" solution had been considered. Ms Barnes advised that there did not appear to be an "off-the-shelf" solution that was working at a state level, but ITD is working with Montana, Vermont and Colorado who are also struggling to find the best solution.

- Mike Key noted that there had been no mention of applying national standards for a data model. Ms Barnes advised that work had started on the data model and experts from Arizona were being brought in to share their knowledge. The Division of Motor Vehicles shares data nationally already and business has to be carried out in a consistent manner. Ms Barnes added that all ITRMC requirements would be complied with.

MOTION: Ms. Jones moved and Col. Shawver seconded a motion to approve the DMV Systems Modernization Project; the motion was passed unanimously.

3) IDAHO TRANSPORTATION DEPARTMENT: Maintenance and Pavement System (MAPS)
Shannon Barnes went on to summarize the MAPS Project. (refer to slides:
http://idaho.gov/itrmc/council/minutes/2009/20091002_ITD_MAPS.pdf

Questions and Discussion
• Rep. Durst questioned whether it would be possible to ascertain the degradation of an asset such as a road surface. Ms Barnes deferred to Juan Oleaga (Project Manager) who stated that this would indeed be possible. The project has an aggressive timeline so the functionality delivered in the short-term will be limited, but in the long term there would be analysis not only on the deterioration rates and degradation life cycles based on construction material etc., but also on the costing side and how to optimize over a 10, 15, or 20 year period.

MOTION: Director Armstrong moved and Mr Potcher seconded a motion to approve the Maintenance and Pavement System (MAPS) Project; the motion was passed unanimously.

4) OFFICE OF THE CIO: IDAHO EDUCATION NETWORK (IEN)
Brady Kraft provided an overview of the IEN project. (refer to slides:
http://idaho.gov/itrmc/council/minutes/2009/20091002_OCIO_IEN.pdf

Questions and Discussion
• Rep. Durst queried the rationale behind the VTC element of this project. Brady explained that while courses can be delivered with asynchronous online content, there remains a large segment of the population that is underserved. The VTC element enables schools to easily access content online from, for instance, IDLA or ISU. Another issue is that of teacher shortages, with VTC schools can more easily share qualified teachers without spending money and time travelling.

• Chairman Gwartney noted that the Albertson Foundation had contributed $6 million and this, together with the $3 million from stimulus funding was being compounded by E-Rate and RUS grants to about 25 million dollars.

• Director Rush commented that the State Board of Education (OSBE) had not been mentioned and, to his knowledge, nobody from OSBE sat on any of the committees associated with this project . Mr Kraft noted that there had been discussions with people from OSBE but they had not been included in the presentation because the IEN is not the content provider, nor does it govern dual credit. The IEN is responsible for providing alternative mechanisms for schools to be able to deliver content, following the standards and guidelines put in place by OSBE. Chairman Gwartney felt that it would be appropriate to include OSBE in presentations to reflect their involvement. Director Rush noted further that the workforce training by ISU, referenced in one of the slides, was not consistent with Board policy. Chairman Gwartney recommended discussing this further with the Superintendent of Public Instruction.

MOTION: Rep. Durst moved and Director Rush seconded a motion to approve the Idaho Education Network Project; the motion was passed unanimously.

ADJOURNMENT
As there was no time to complete the agenda, Director Gwartney suggested deferring the remaining projects to another time, there were no objections and the meeting adjourned. A meeting will be arranged to take place ahead of the meeting scheduled for December.

Respectfully submitted,

Sally Brevick, Office of the CIO